

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of March 21, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14, 17, 19, and 20 have been amended. New claims 21-28 have been added. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-28 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 3-8, 11-16, 19 and 20 stand rejected as being dependent on rejected independent claims 1, 9 and 17. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Without acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 17 to present the claims in a more preferred form.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 9 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,559,548 to Davis, et al. ("Davis"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other features, "...determining at least two meaningful words in a program title; determining a less descriptive word from the at least two meaningful words based on a frequency that each of the at least two meaningful words appear in a database..."

Davis fails to disclose these features of claim 1. Davis, at best, describes that "the data processor compares the title with a stored library of shortened titles to determine if the title had previously been shortened while editing another listings database." (See col. 18, lines 35-39). That is, Davis merely discloses comparing a title to be shortened to previously shortened titles contained in a database, and if such title had been shortened and stored in the database, the stored shortened title is selected. Nowhere does Davis teach or suggest determining at least two meaningful words in a program title; determining a less descriptive word from the at least two meaningful words based on a frequency that each of the at least two meaningful words appear in a database. In view of the above, claim 1 is allowable over Davis.

Amended independent claims 9 and 17 recite features similar to those recited in claim 1 and thus are allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-5, 8, 11-13, 16, 19-20 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,279,018 to Kudrolli, et al. (“Kudrolli”).

Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,981,217 to Knauff et al. (“Knauff”).

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Kudrolli and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,225 to Hejna, Jr. (“Hejna”) Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Notwithstanding the propriety of combining Davis and Kudrolli, Kudrolli fails to remedy the deficiencies described above with respect to claims 1, 9 and 17, upon which claims 3-5, 8, 11-13, 16 and 19-20 respectively depend. At best, Kudrolli describes replacement of less commonly used phrases and words. See for example col. 7, lines 45 - 46. Nonetheless, Kudrolli does not teach or suggest determining a less descriptive word based on the frequency of the word in a database. That is, while Kudrolli discloses determining the commonality of the word, Kudrolli fails to teach or suggest determining a descriptiveness of a word based on the frequency with which the word exists in a database. As such, the combination of Davis and Kudrolli does not result in the invention of claims 3-5 and 8, which depend from claim 1, claims 11-13 and 16, which depend from claim 17, and claims 19-20, which depend from claim 17. Claims 3-5, 8, 11-13, 16, and 19-20 are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further in view of the other novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the combination of Davis and Knauff is proper, Knauff fails to remedy the deficiencies of Davis described above with respect to claims 1 and 9 (from which claims 6 and 14 depend, respectively). Therefore, claims 6 and 14 are patentably distinct from the combination of Davis and Knauff for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 9, respectively, and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Even assuming, without admitting, that the combination of Davis, Kudrolli and Hejna is proper, Kudrolli and Hejna, alone or in combination, fail to remedy the deficiencies of Davis

described above with respect to Applicants' claims 1 and 9 (from which claims 7 and 15 depend, respectively). Therefore, claims 7 and 15 are patentably distinct from the combination of Davis, Kudrolli and Hejna for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 9, respectively, and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

New Claims 21-28

New claims 21-28 are fully supported by the specification and believed allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 9, and 17, their ultimate base claims, respectively, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 19, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/

Chunhsi Andy Mu

Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001